

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD,
Plaintiff,
v.
SAFY, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00637-TLN-EFB

ORDER

Plaintiff proceeds without counsel in this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On November 12, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties, and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 31.) Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

////

1 E.D. Cal. Local Rule 220. Put plainly, the amended complaint must sufficiently allege each
2 claim. Here, Plaintiff did not allege facts connecting Defendant Spangler to the allegations
3 against Defendants Larson and Safy. As Plaintiff has had several opportunities to state a
4 cognizable claim against Spangler and has not done so, the Court agrees with the magistrate judge
5 that further amendment would be futile.

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations filed November 12, 2024, are ADOPTED IN
8 FULL;
9 2. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Spangler are DISMISSED without prejudice and
10 without leave to amend; and
11 3. The case is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Date: December 13, 2024

14
15
16 

17 TROY L. NUNLEY
18 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28